

with enmity and suspicion, it cannot be expected that he will make your country the home of himself and his descendants; and other States, more sagacious, will derive the benefit of his skill, capital and citizenship. Our last want is capital to develop the great and varied resources of this State. It is to be obtained by labor, and from abroad, by making its profits remunerative to the owner. With these wants supplied, there is no reason to view our future gloomily; on the contrary, there is much to hope for ourselves and our posterity.

We have emerged from a long and disastrous war, with our cities and towns burnt, our houses destroyed, our fields and plantations ravaged, and our wealth scattered, but we are in no worse condition than our forefathers when they came out of the revolution. Their virtue and labor and economy soon made them a more prosperous people than ever before. Why may not the same qualities work out the same happy result for us? It is vain to indulge in repinings over the misfortunes of the past. Our work is with and for the future. If we are to deserve well of the country and of posterity, it must depend on the fidelity with which it is executed.

A new Constitution has been adopted, and by it your Government has been liberalized. Every citizen may aspire to its honors; and if esteemed worthy by his fellows, may occupy its high places. It merits a fair trial from the people, and will doubtless receive it. The hope is ardently cherished by me that every change made in the old Constitution may prove a merit of the criminal law, the evil passions of bad and inconsiderate men will be restrained, and order soon restored to society.

The total destruction of large tracts of country by an invading army, and the exhaustion of the entire State, consequent upon a long war, incapacitates the people from paying the usual amount of taxes, and it behooves all departments of the Government to practice and enforce a rigid economy. The annual appropriations heretofore made will undergo the closest scrutiny, and whenever a reduction can be made, or the appropriation entirely dispensed with, it will be done. All supernumerary offices abolished, and the salaries of those continued reduced whenever it can be done without detriment to the public service, so that the expenditures for the support of the Government will be reduced to the most frugal standard. The Executive Department will cordially co-operate with you in all measures to reduce the expenses of the State to the lowest standard compatible with its efficient administration.

Invoking the blessing of Almighty God on our united efforts to ameliorate the condition of our desolated and afflicted country, and appealing to Him for wisdom, moderation and fortitude in the discharge of our grave and arduous labors, I am prepared to take the oath to support the Constitution of this State and the United States, and enter upon the duties of Chief Magistrate of South Carolina.

Hon. B. F. Dunkin, Chief Justice of the State of South Carolina, then administered to the Governor elect the Constitutional oath of office.

The Senate retired to their Chamber.

On motion of Mr. WARLEY,

Ordered, That when this House adjourns, it be adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock A. M.

On motion of Mr. WARLEY, the House was adjourned at half-past 2 o'clock P. M.

The West and South.

Before the inauguration of the late war, the intimate commercial and political relations between these two sections was universally recognized. The most effective arguments employed in the North-west against the secession of the Southern States, were based upon these relations. The South afforded a market for a large portion of the surplus products of the West. The Mississippi River was the natural highway by means of which the corn, the flour and the provisions of the West were exchanged for the sugar and other products of the South. So intimate were these commercial relations, so essential did the one section seem to the other, that there were many statesmen at the South who predicted that even if the war should terminate in Southern independence, but a few years would elapse before the North-west would be part of the same country. There were Western statesmen who entertained a similar view of the question.

The political affinities between the two sections, based upon commercial interests, were scarcely less decided. Both sections were essentially agricultural. Manufactories, it is true, existed in both, but the manufacturing interest was subordinate to the great interests of agriculture. There existed in the whole Mississippi valley a strong feeling of hostility to the New England views of a high protective tariff, which taxed heavily the agriculturist for the benefit of the manufacturer. The policy of these sections was less aggressive to other interests than the policy of the New England statesmen. It was essentially conservative in its character. It sought to prevent their own interests from being invaded, rather than to encroach on the rights and interests of other sections. The West long resisted the spirit of propagandism sent forth from New England. They felt that the conservatism of the South was essential in the Union to prevent the continual encroachments of the New England policy. And there were multitudes at the South who regretted the action of the Southern States in seceding, because it severed them from faithful political allies, who, had they remained in the Union, would have continued to render their powerful aid at the ballot, to beat back the wave of revolution continually rolling from New England.

Those conservatives at the West who had hitherto been disposed to protect the Constitutional rights of the South were irritated at the attempted secession. They charged that they had been abandoned by their allies and left to the mercy of Northern radicalism. They felt that they could not afford to be left thus alone. They became at once the

most persistent advocates of coercion. They insisted on following the Mississippi to its outlet, and on vindicating their theory that the South could not be dissevered from the West. They fought for the restoration of the Union—not for its destruction. They, more than any other section, have succeeded in breaking the power of the South.

And now, that armed opposition is at an end, it remains for it to be seen whether the West will permit the State organizations of the South to be blotted out of existence, and the country converted into *satrapies* under military commanders, or whether they will insist on the restoration of the Union for which they so successfully fought. The interests of the West and South are still almost identical.

The New England politicians, encouraged by success, have become more aggressive than ever. Their interests are set up as a guide for the policy to be pursued by the Government. They insist that the West shall enter into their feelings of vindictiveness against the South, and shall aid them in humiliating still further an unresisting people. The Southern States have ceased their opposition. They have laid down their arms. In doing so, it was not to become slaves. They recognized that the struggle would result either in independence or in returning to the Union. The whole North sounded but one war-cry: "The Union as it was, and the Constitution as it is." In giving up the contest, the South accepted that result. They now claim its fulfillment.

They claim a concession by the country of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Every State and every citizen is interested in the granting of the claim. The North-west, especially, whose prosperity depends so much on that of the South, is vitally interested in this restoration. If one State may be blotted out of existence, so may another. New England will never cease to wield a revolutionary power until her policy is effectually checked in the halls of legislation. For her own aggrandizement she will encroach upon any other rights and upon any other interests. Will the West sacrifice her own interests to kneel at the throne of New England? Or will she assume the position in the national councils to which she is entitled, and restore the Union and the Constitution as they were before the war, and cause the arbitrary rule of military authority to yield again to the supremacy of civil law?

[New Orleans Crescent.]

Several of the prominent dry goods houses in New York are having wires extended from their establishments to the general office of the telegraph company.

Remarks of Speaker Colfax on the Admission of Southern Members.

On Saturday last, a large number of the friends of ex-Speaker Colfax complimented him with a serenade by the Marine Band, in Washington city, on which occasion he made a speech. After thanking them for the honor done him, and referring to the condition of the country, now as compared with the time of the closing of the last Congress, he proceeded at length to speak of the probable action of the next Congress, when representatives of the States lately in rebellion would be seeking admission to take part in the legislation of the country and said:

The Constitution, which seems framed for every emergency, gives to each House the exclusive right to judge of the qualifications, election and return of its members, and I apprehend they will exercise that right. Congress, having passed no law on reconstruction, President Johnson prescribed certain action for these States, which he deemed indispensable to their restoration to their former relations to the Government, which I think eminently wise and patriotic. First—That their conventions should declare the various ordinances of secession null and void, not as some have done, merely repealing them, but absolutely, without any force or effect. Second—That their Legislatures should adopt the Constitutional amendment abolishing slavery, that this cause of dissension and rebellion might be utterly extirpated. Third—That they shall formally repudiate the rebel debt, though, by its terms, it will be a long while before it fell due, as it was to be payable six months after the recognition of the Confederacy by the United States.

This reminds me of an old friend in Indiana, who said he liked to give his notes payable ten days after convenience. [Laughter and applause, and cries of "good."] But there are other terms on which I think there is no division among the loyal men of the Union. First, that the Declaration of Independence must be recognized as the law of the land, and every man, alien or native, white or black, protected in the inalienable and God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Mr. Lincoln, in that emancipation proclamation, which is the proudest wreath in his chaplet of fame, [applause.] not only gave freedom to the slave, but declared that the Government would maintain that freedom. [Applause.] We cannot abandon them and leave them defenceless at the mercy of their former owners.

They must be protected in their right of person and property, and these freemen must have the right to sue in courts of justice for all just claims, and testify also, so as to have security against outrage and wrong. I call them freemen, not freedmen. The last phrase might have answered before their freedom was fully secured, but they should be regarded now as freemen of the Republic.

Second—The amendments of their State Constitutions, which have been adopted by many of their conventions—so reluctantly under the pressure of despatches from the President and Secretary of State—should be ratified by a majority of their people. We all know that but a very small portion of their voters participated in the election of delegates to these conventions, and nearly, if not all the conventions, have declared them in force without any ratification by the people.

When that crisis has passed, can they not turn around and say that these were adopted under duress, by delegates elected by a meagre vote under provisional governors and military authorities, and never ratified by a popular vote; and could they not turn anti-Lecompton arguments against us, and insist, as we did, that a Constitution not ratified by the people, may have legal effect, but no moral effect whatever.

Third—The President can, on all occasions, insist that they should elect Congressmen, who could take the oath prescribed by the Act of 1862, but in defiance of this, and insulting to the President and the country, they have in a large majority of instances voted down mercilessly, Union men who could take the oath, and elected those who boasted that they could not, would not, ay, and would feel disgraced if they could. Without mentioning names, a gentleman elected in Alabama by a large majority, declared in his address to the people before this election that the iron man of history would record the emancipation act as the most monstrous deed of cruelty that ever darkened the annals of any nation.

And another one, who avowed that he gave all possible aid and comfort

to the rebellion, denounced that Congress of 1862, as guilty in enacting such an oath. [A voice—"Put them on probation."] The South is filled with men who can take the oath; it declares:

"I have not voluntarily taken part in the rebellion." Every conscript in the Southern army can take that oath, because he was forced to the ranks by the conscription act, and every man who staid at home and refused to accept civil or military official positions could take that oath. But these were not the choice of the States lately in rebellion.

Fourth—While it must be expected that a minority of these States will cherish, for years, perhaps, their feelings of disloyalty, the country has a right to expect that before their members are admitted to share in the government of this country, a clear majority of the people of each of these States should give evidence of their earnest and cheerful loyalty—not by speeches, as are so common, "that they submitted the issue to the arbitration of war"—but that they are willing to stand by and fight for the flag of the country against all its enemies, at home and abroad. The danger is in too much precipitation. Let us, rather, make haste slowly, and we can then hope that the foundation of our Government, when thus reconstructed on the basis of indisputable loyalty, will be as eternal as the stars. [Applause.]

He then wound up with a laudation of the patriotic course of President Johnson, and a tremendous eulogy on the benefit of free labor and the benefits of the Union.

The Washington correspondence of the Baltimore Sun says, in commenting on the above speech:

The topic of to-day is the speech of Mr. Colfax, at the National Hotel, last evening. He has said that he had only a brief interview with the President, therefore his remarks are not to be regarded as indicating the character of the forthcoming message. But Mr. Colfax has been speaker and is likely to be again. He is demonstrative, as was shown last winter, by descending from the chair to institute proceedings against Mr. Harris, of your State. He is ambitious, and therefore has recalled his expressed determination of retiring from Congress, and he probably looks higher than to the third office in honor in the Government.

Mr. Colfax, like Mr. Forney, and perhaps a very few others, throws out ideas which he intends shall influence the course of the President and enlist the support of the country. These views look to legislation that will disturb the South for a decade, if they are not tabooed by a sound public opinion. They as much as desired of the President to make other requirements of the South than he has done. Nothing short of that condition that will make the rebel States what the East Indies are to Great Britain will satisfy the plunderers whose names are legion. I believe that they will fail in their aim if they much depend upon the President for aid and comfort.

Reconstruction and the Constitution.

The letter of Wade Hampton to the people of South Carolina, which we published a few days since, contained the following declaration in reference to President Johnson's policy for re-adjusting the Southern States: "The President had no shadow of authority, I admit, under the Constitution of the United States, to order a convention in this or any other State; but as a conqueror he had the right to offer, if not to dictate, terms." If Wade Hampton intended to convey the idea that the power used by the President, in his efforts to re-organize the South, is extra constitutional, he is right in his inference. The President has no power, according to the letter of the Constitution, to pursue the course which he has adopted in his reconstruction policy. But Wade Hampton and the class of men who look upon our present condition from his stand-point fail to comprehend or understand the expansive power of the Constitution—a power not expressed, but inherent in it as a necessity for self-preservation.

The framers of our Constitution provided for the suppression of a rebellion or insurrection, and gave to the President and Congress ample authority to adopt measures to accomplish that purpose and enforce the laws in every locality. All this is included in the war provisions of the Constitution, and it is here that we find the expansive power of that charter. While the authors of the Constitution provided for the suppression of a rebellion, they did not incorporate in that instrument explicit provisions for reconstructing a State,

for no such emergency was ever expected by them to arise. But common sense tells us that it was not, therefore, intended that a State was to be left without a local government, and its citizens in an unprotected condition, as they would be, when the rebellion was put down. It seems to us that the inference is clearly deducible that the power given to the President under the war provisions of the Constitution carries with it, as a necessity, the authority to re-organize those localities which have been in rebellion; that this, in fact, is a part and parcel of the war power vested in the President and Congress; for the work of enforcing the laws and suppressing the insurrection is not completed until the machinery of the local or civil government is fully adjusted and placed in efficient working order. There is not to be found in the Constitution one word or syllable authorizing the President or Congress to hold a State which has been in rebellion as conquered territory. Any such attempt on the part of either would be unquestionably a direct violation not only of the letter but the spirit of that instrument, as well as of fundamental law. It follows, therefore, that the only course is for the President to adopt such measures as will secure immediate organization of the local governments and enforcement of the civil laws which existed in the rebellious States previous to the insurrection. This is the authority which the President is now exercising in his efforts to re-organize the South.

No person would for a moment claim that a proclamation abolishing slavery, issued in time of peace, would be constitutional; but it is clearly constitutional when promulgated during a rebellion as a war measure. The same rule will apply to the appointment of Provisional Governors. They come in under the war power and are part of the machinery used to perfect and complete the work of suppressing the rebellion. If the framers of the Constitution intended that an insurrection should be crushed out, they could not have desired the work to be half completed, but thorough in all respects. Nor was it possible for them to enunciate the precise mode of proceeding as soon as the organized resistance had been overcome, for the simple reason that it was beyond their power to tell where or how a rebellion would rise, and, furthermore, no two cases would require the same treatment in the final settlement. All this had to be left to the expansive power of the Constitution and the common sense of those who administered it at the time that the events occurred. It is here that the President obtains the right to demand that each of those States which have been in rebellion shall ratify the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery. It is here that he finds the power to justify him in insisting that the late slaves shall be allowed to testify in courts of justice. It is from this source that he has the authority to declare that the rebel debt shall be repudiated. Unless we deny that the Constitution gives to Congress and the President ample power to suppress insurrection and enforce the laws in all sections of the country, it must be admitted that the authority to set aside the rebellious local governments in the States which have been in rebellion and to re-organize them, is also fully inferred and intended, although not explicitly expressed. Any other conclusion would plunge us into endless confusion and lead us step by step until we finally landed in chaos and ruin.—N. Y. Herald.

GENERAL KILPATRICK.—The distinguished political services of Gen. Kilpatrick in stamping New Jersey are rewarded. He goes to Chili, with twelve thousand dollars per annum in gold, besides his pay as Major-General in the regular army. The World, commenting on this significant illustration of the ancient adage that "loyalty is the best policy," alludes as follows to the Secretary's other compliment to Kilpatrick:

It is rather to Mr. Stanton's credit that upon granting Gen. Kilpatrick, in his usual royal style, an "audience of leave," he turned to his Adjutant and ordered the name of "Fort Ranyon," near Washington, to be changed to "Fort Kilpatrick." Gen. Kilpatrick himself probably failed to feel, as his fellow-soldiers and the country will, the sarcastic impertinence of the compliment by which a fort, baptized throughout the war and under fire by the name of so gallant a soldier as General Ranyon, is selected, upon the return of peace, to commemorate his own achievements on the safe and profitable "stamp."